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1. Most important problem is this study is the "low risk patients" selection. Most practical use of second generation LMA in obstetric anaesthesia would be as an emergency rescue device in case of failed intubation. As incidence of failed intubation would be logically higher in patients having predictors of difficult airway, results of this study can not be extrapolated to those patients.

2. Another limitation is the absence of a controlled group. Probably practicing obstetric anaesthetists would be more interested to know that most suitable second generation LMA in case of failed intubation.

3. A 6% incidence of sore throat in low risk patients actually not very low, and further discussion is required in this area.
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